

# BACONIANA.

---

VOL. IX. *Third Series.* JANUARY, 1911. No. 33.

---

## THE MYSTERY OF FRANCIS BACON.

THE facts which have come down to us as to the early life of Francis Bacon are of a very meagre character. The first biography which appeared is styled "Discourse sur la Vie de M. Bacon," and is prefixed to "L'Histoire Naturelle," published in Paris in the year 1631, but this is rather in the nature of an appreciation of his work and character than an account of the incidents of his life. In 1657 his chaplain, William Rawley, published with the first edition of the "Resuscitatio" what he described as a life of the author. Having regard to Rawley's intimate knowledge of the man and the wealth of information which was at his disposal, as an account of Bacon's life it is insufficient and disappointing. In 1679 Archbishop Tennison, in a publication entitled "Baconiana," added very slightly to previous knowledge. In 1740 D. Mallet, when publishing an edition of Bacon's works, included an account of his life, which was gathered together from historical documents and previous publications, and though this is of value, it still leaves the reader unable to form any adequate conception of the most distinguished Englishman of the Elizabethan and Jacobean period. In the nineteenth century Montague, Hepworth Dixon and Spedding added to the store of

knowledge, but in spite of their efforts a satisfactory life of Bacon has yet to be written, or, at any rate, yet to be published. Perhaps the reader, by the aid of Hepworth Dixon rather than by that of any other writer, is able to form a conception of the real man which approaches more nearly to accuracy. When it is remembered that James Spedding devoted his life to the investigation of Bacon's works and of every letter and scrap of manuscript which he could discover which bore upon Bacon's life and works, it may be considered presumptuous for anyone to attempt to add to those fourteen volumes, which will ever remain a monument of his devotion, literary ability and patience. It has been said \* that Spedding's devotion is one of the greatest tributes existing to Bacon's worth.

Notwithstanding this lack of encouragement to any attempt at unravelling the mysteries surrounding a life which must ever have a fascination for all students of philosophy, of literature, or of humanism, the following notes are offered with diffidence, as the result of many years' study of, and enthusiasm for, the man and his work.

It may be that the evidence at present available will not justify some of the conclusions. It may be that imagination has played too prominent a part in weaving together what purports to be a historical sketch, but these notes are put forward simply as suggestions, with the hope that they may be supplemented or corrected, where necessary, by those who have fuller knowledge of the subject.

In the registry of St. Martins will be found the entry :—

"Mr.† Franciscus Bacon, 1560. Jan. 25 (filius D'm Nicho Bacon Magni Anglie sigilli custodis),"

\* "Pioneer Humanists," by J. M. Robertson, Watts & Co., 1907.

† "Mr." is interlined in a different coloured ink.

as on 22nd January, 1560 (according to the present computation of years, 1561). In April, 1573, he went to Trinity College, Cambridge, his age being 12 years and 3 months,\* where he remained until Christmas, 1575. If it were possible to know how far his education had advanced when he entered Cambridge a consideration of the next ten years of his life would be made much easier.

Little is known of his early education. That it was ample is evident from the stand which he took upon leaving Cambridge. His father, Sir Nicholas Bacon, was a classical scholar. That is gathered from the "Art of English Poesie," where the unknown author states that he has found Sir Nicholas sitting in his gallery with the works of Quintilian before him, of which at that time there was no English translation. The unknown author adds, "Indeede he was a most eloquent man and of rare learning and wisdome, as ever I knew England to breed and one that joyed as much in learned men and men of good witts." During the tender years of his boyhood it is by Lady Anne Bacon that his instruction would be directed. She, with her sisters, inherited from her father, Sir Anthony Cooke, an aptitude for the study of classical languages, and was so expert in Greek that she translated Jewell's "Apologia Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ" into English. Rawley describes her as "being exquisitely skilled, for a woman, in the Greek and Latin tongues."

Having regard to the conditions under which he was brought up, to what we know of him in subsequent years, and in view of his phenomenal intelligence, it is a fair deduction to make, that at twelve years of age, when he entered Cambridge, he was an expert scholar in Latin and Greek.† No fact, no tradition, has

\* Whitgift accounts "Brit. Nag.," Vol. XXX. III, p. 444.

† At six years old Agrippa D'Aubigné (1560—1630) is said to



come down to us as to his work whilst at college. The author of the "Discourse sur la Vie de M. Bacon," however, says: "Le jugement et la mémoire ne furent jamais en aucun homme au degré qu'ils estoient en celui-cy; de sorte qu'en bien peu de temps il se rendit fort habile en toutes les sciences qui s'apprennent au collège." Here, therefore, is the testimony of a contemporary—a man who knew Bacon—that when he left Cambridge he had acquired a great store of knowledge. But there is further evidence of the condition of his mind at this stage. It was whilst at the university that "he first fell into the dislike of the philosophy of Aristotle; not for the worthlessness of the author, to whom he would ever subscribe all high attributes, but for the unfruitfulness of the way; being a philosophy (as his lordship used to say) only strong for disputations and contentions, but barren of the productions of works for the benefit of the life of man."\*

One other point must be dwelt upon. Lady Anne Bacon was not only learned, but she was a deeply religious woman, full of affection and puritanic fervour, and deeply interested in the condition of the Church. It is therefore obvious that during the early years of Bacon's life he would receive religious training of an earnest character. John Whitgift, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, was master of Trinity during his residence there. This training (although now having an Ecclesiastical instead of a Puritanic tendency) would be continued under him. Bacon's earliest letters, all his subsequent writings, bear evidence of his strong religious fervour, which culminates in that magnificent psalm described by Addison as the prayer of an angel rather than of a man.

have been able to read Latin, Greek and Hebrew ("A Short History of French Literature": Saintsbury, p. 212. John Stuart Mill).

\* Rawley's MSS., Spedding, Vol. I.

This, then, is the boy who, at sixteen years of age, went under the care of Sir Amias Paulet when on a mission to the Court of France. In 1578 he returned to England with messages to the Queen, and it was then that a picture of him was painted by Hilliard, the Court miniature painter, who inscribed round it, as Spedding says, the significant words—the natural ejaculation, we may presume, of the artist's own emotion—"Si tabula daretur digna, animum mallet": "If one could only find materials worthy to paint his mind."

It was about this time that he had projected his first essay on philosophy, which he modestly termed "*Temporis Partus Maximus*." It is said this work has not come down to posterity, but it may be possible to trace it under another title.

---

Spedding states that the earliest composition of Bacon which he had been able to discover is a letter written in his twentieth year from Grays Inn. From that time forward, he continues, compositions succeed each other without any considerable interval, and in following them we shall accompany him step by step through his life. What are the compositions which Spedding places as being written but not published up to the year 1597, when the first small volume of 10 essays containing less than 5,000 words was issued from the press? These are they:—

Notes on the State of Christendom\* (date 1580 to 1584).

A Letter of Attorney for Anth. Bacon.

Letter of Advice to the Queen (1584—1586).

An Advertisement touching the Controversies of the Church of England (1586—1589).

\* Spedding prints this in small type, being doubtful as to the authorship.

Speeches written for some Court device, namely, Mr. Bacon in praise of Knowledge, and Mr. Bacon's discourse in praise of his Sovereign (1590—1592).

Certain observations made upon a libel published this present year, 1592.

A true report of the Detestable Treason intended by Dr. Roderigo Lopez, 1594.

Gesta Grayorum, 1594, parts of which are printed by Spedding in type denoting doubtful authorship.

Bacon's device, 1594—1598.

Three letters to the Earl of Rutland on his travels, 1595—1596.

That is all! These are the compositions which follow each other without considerable interval, and by which we are to accompany him step by step through those seventeen years which should be the most important years in a man's life! He could have turned them out in ten days or a fortnight with ease. We expect from Mr. Spedding bread, and he gives us a stone!

This brilliant young man, who, when 15 years of age, left Cambridge, having possessed himself of all the knowledge it could afford to a student, who had travelled in France, Spain and Italy to "polish his mind and mould his opinion by intercourse with all kinds of foreigners," how was he occupying himself during what should be the most fruitful years of his life? Following his profession at the Bar? His affections did not that way tend. Spedding expresses the opinion that he had a distaste for his profession, and, writing of the circumstances with which he was surrounded in 1592, says: "I do not find that he was getting into practice. His main object still was to find ways and means for prosecuting his great philosophical enterprise." What was this enterprise? "I confess that I have as vast contemplative ends as I have moderate means," he says, writing to Burghley, "for I have taken all knowledge



to be my province." This means more than mere academic philosophy.

In 1593, when Bacon was put forward and upheld for a year as a candidate for the post of Attorney-General, Spedding writes of him: "He had had little or no practice in the courts; what proof he had given of professional proficiency was confined to his readings and exercises in Grays Inn. . . . Law, far from being his only, was not even his favourite study; . . . his head was full of ideas so new and large that to most about him they must have seemed visionary."

Writing of him in 1594 Spedding says: "The strongest point against Bacon's pretensions for the Attorneyship was his want of practice. His opponents said that 'he had never entered the place of battle.'\* Whether this was because he could not find clients or did not seek them I cannot say." In order to meet the objection, Bacon, on the 25th January, 1593-4, made his first pleading, and Burghley sent his secretary "to congratulate unto him the first fruits of his public practice."

There is one other misconception to be corrected. It is urged that Bacon was, during this period, engrossed in Parliamentary life. From 1584 to 1597 five Parliaments were summoned. Bacon sat in each. In his twenty-fifth year he was elected member for Melcombe, in Dorsetshire. In the Parliament of 1586 he sat for Taunton, in that of 1588 for Liverpool, in that of 1592-3 for Middlesex, and in 1597 for Ipswich.

But the sittings of these Parliaments were not of long duration, and the speeches which he delivered and the meetings of committees upon which he was appointed would absorb but a small portion of his time. It must be patent, therefore, that Spedding does not account for his occupations from his return to

England in 1578 until 1597, when the first small volume of his Essays was published.

During the whole of this period Bacon was in monetary difficulties, and yet there is no evidence that he was living a life of dissipation or even of extravagance. On the contrary, all testimony would point to the conclusion that he was following the path of a strictly moral and studious young man. On his return to England he took lodgings in Coney Court, Grays Inn. There Anthony found him when he returned from abroad.

There are no data upon which to form any reliable opinion as to the amount of his income at this time. Rawley states that Sir Nicholas Bacon had collected a considerable sum of money which he had separated with intention to have made a competent purchase of land for the livelihood of his youngest son, but the purchase being unaccomplished at his death Francis received only a fifth portion of the money dividable, by which means he lived in some straits and necessities in his younger years. It is not clear whether the "money dividable" was only that separated by Sir Nicholas, or whether he left other sums which went to augment the fund divisible amongst the brothers. His other children were well provided for. Lady Bacon lived at Gorhambury. She was not extravagant, and yet in 1589 she was so impoverished that Captain Allen, in writing to Anthony, speaking of his mother, Lady Bacon, says she "also saith her jewels be spent for you, and that she borrowed the last money of seven several persons." Whatever her resources were, they had by then been exhausted for her sons. Anthony was apparently a man of considerable means. He was master of the manor and priory of Redburn, of the manor of Abbotsbury, Minchinbury and Hoves, in the parish of Barley, in the county of Hertford; of the



Brightfirth wood, Merydanmeads, and Plumer-Stoke farms, in the county of Middlesex.\*

But within a few years after his return to England Anthony was borrowing money wherever he could. Mother and brother appear to have exhausted their resources and their borrowing capabilities. There is an account showing that in eighteen months, about 1593, Anthony lent Francis £373, equivalent to nearly £3,000 at to-day's value. In 1597 Francis was arrested by the sheriff for a debt of £300, for which a money-lender had obtained judgment against him, and he was cast into the Tower. Where had all the money gone? There is no adequate explanation.

---

The first letter of Francis Bacon's which Spedding met with, to which reference has already been made, is dated 11th July, 1580, to Mr. Doyley, and is of little importance. The six letters which follow—all there are between 1580 and 1590†—relate to one subject, and are of great significance. The first is dated from Grays Inn, 16th September, 1580, to Lady Burghley. In it young Francis, now 19 years of age, makes this request: "That it would please your Ladyship in your letters wherewith you visit my good Lord to vouchsafe the mention and recommendation of my suit; wherein your Ladyship shall bind me more unto you that I can look ever to be able to sufficiently acknowledge."

\* "Story of Lord Bacon's Life." Hepworth Dixon, p. 28.

† The two letters of 16th September, 1580, and that of 15th October, 1580, are taken from copies in the Lansdowne collection. That of the 6th May, 1586, is in the same collection, and is an original in Bacon's handwriting. The letter of 25th August, 1585, is also in his handwriting, and is in the State's Paper Office, Domestic. The letter without date, presumably written to Burghley in 1591, is from the supplement to the "Resuscitatio," 1657.

The next letter—written on the same day—is addressed to Lord Burghley. Its object is thus set forth :—

“My letter hath no further errand but to commend unto your Lordship the remembrance of my suit which then I moved unto you, whereof it also pleased your Lordship to give me good hearing so far forth as to promise to tender it unto her Majesty, and withal to add in the behalf of it that which I may better deliver by letter than by speech, which is, that although it must be confessed that the request is rare and unaccustomed, yet if it be observed how few there be which fall in with the study of the common laws either being well left or friended, or at their own free election, or forsaking likely success in other studies of more delight and no less preferment, or setting hand thereunto early without waste of years upon such survey made, it may be my case may not seem ordinary, no more than my suit, and so more be-seeming unto it. As I force myself to say this in excuse of my motion, lest it should appear unto your Lordship altogether un-discreet and unadvised, so my hope to obtain it resteth only upon your Lordship's good affection towards me and grace with her Majesty, who methinks needeth never to call for the experience of the thing, where she hath so great and so good of the person which recommendeth it.”

What was this suit? Spedding cannot suggest any explanation. He says: “What the particular employment was for which he hoped I cannot say; something probably connected with the service of the Crown, to which the memory of his father, an old and valued servant prematurely lost, his near relationship to the Lord Treasurer, and the personal notice which he had himself received from the Queen, would naturally lead him to look. . . . The proposition, whatever it was, having been explained to Burghley in conversation, is only alluded to in these letters: It seems to have been so far out of the common way as to require an apology, and the terms of the apology imply that it was for some employment as a lawyer. And this is all the light I can throw upon it.” Subsequently Spedding

says the motion was one\* "which would in some way have made it unnecessary for him to follow 'a course of practice,' meaning, I presume, ordinary practice at the Bar."

Another expression in the letter makes it clear that the object of the suit was an experiment. The Queen could not have "experience of the thing," and Bacon solicited Burghley's recommendation, because she would not need the experience if he, so great and so good, vouched for it.

Burghley appears to have tendered the suit to the Queen, for there is a letter dated 18th October, 1580, addressed to him by Bacon, commencing:

"Your Lordship's comfortable relation to her Majesty's gracious opinion and meaning towards me, though at that time your leisure gave me not leave to show how I was affected therewith, yet upon every representation thereof it entereth and striketh so much more deeply into me, as both my nature and duty presseth me to return some speech of thankfulness."

Spedding remarks thereon: "It seems that he had spoken to Burghley on the subject and made some overture, which Burghley undertook to recommend to the Queen; and that the Queen, who though slow to bestow favours was careful always to encourage hopes, entertained the motion graciously and returned a favourable answer. The proposition, whatever it was, having been explained to Burghley in conversation, is only alluded to in these letters."

Spedding dismisses these three letters in 22 lines of comment, which contain the extracts before set out. He regards the matter as of slight consequence, and admits that he can throw no light upon it. But he points out that it was "so far out of the common way as to require an apology." Surely he has not well weighed the



terms of the apology when he says they "imply that it was for some employment as a lawyer."

There had been a conversation between Bacon and Burghley during which Bacon had submitted a project to the accomplishment of which he was prepared to devote his life in the Queen's service. It necessitated his abandoning the profession of the law. Apparently Burghley had remonstrated with him, in the manner of experienced men of the world, against forsaking a certain road and avenue to preferment in favour of any course rare and unaccustomed. Referring in his letter to this, Bacon's parenthetical clause beginning "either being well left or friended," etc., is confession and avoidance. In effect he says: "Few study the common laws who have influence; few at their own free election; few desert studies of more delight and no less preferment; and few devote themselves to that study from their earliest years. Since there are few who, having my opportunities, devote themselves to the study of the common laws, my position in so doing would not be an ordinary one, no more than is my suit. Therefore, why should I, having your [Burleigh's] influence to help me, sacrifice my great intellectual capabilities fitting me to accomplish my great contemplative ends? Why should I sacrifice them to a study of the common laws?"

The sentence may be otherwise construed, but in any case it involves an apology for the abandonment of the profession which had been chosen for him.

The next letter is addressed to the Right Honourable Sir Francis Walsingham, principal secretary to her Majesty, and is dated from Grays Inn, 25th of August, 1585. Spedding's comment on it is as follows:—

"For all this time, it seems, the suit (whatever it was) which he had made to her through Burghley in 1580 remained in suspense, neither granted nor denied, and the uncertainty prevented him

from settling his course of life. From the following letter to Walsingham we may gather two things more concerning it: it was something which had been objected to as unfit for so young a man; and which would in some way have made it unnecessary for him to follow 'a course of practice'—meaning, I presume, ordinary practice at the Bar."

This is the letter:—

"It may please your Honour to give me leave amidst your great and diverse business to put you in remembrance of my poor suit, leaving the time unto your Honour's best opportunity and commodity. I think the objection of my years will wear away with the length of my suit. The very stay doth in this respect concern me, because I am thereby hindered to take a course of practice which, by the leave of God, if her Majesty like not my suit, I must and will follow: not for any necessity of estate, but for my credit sake, which I know by living out of action will wear. I spake when the Court was at Theball's to Mr. Vice-Chamberlain,\* who promised me his furtherance; which I did lest he mought be made for some other. If it may please your Honour, who as I hear hath great interest in him, to speak with him in it, I think he will be fast mine."

Spedding remarks: "This is the last we hear of this suit, the nature and fate of which must both be left to conjecture. With regard to its fate, my own conjecture is that he presently gave up all hope of success in it, and tried instead to obtain through his interest at Court some furtherance in the direct line of his profession."

He adds: "The solid groundson which Bacon's pretensions rested had not yet been made manifest to the apprehension of Bench and Bar; his mind was full of matters with which they could have no sympathy, and the shy and studious habits which we have seen so offend Mr. Faunt would naturally be misconstrued in the same way by many others." †

This passage refers to a letter to Burghley dated the

\* This was Sir Christopher Hatton.

† "Life and Letters," Vol. I. p. 59.

6th of the following May, *i.e.*, 1586, from which it will be seen that the last had not been heard of the motion. Burghley had been remonstrating with Bacon as to reports which had come to him of his nephew's proceedings. Bacon writes :—

“I take it as an undoubted sign of your Lordship's favour unto me that being hardly informed of me you took occasion rather of good advice than of evil opinion thereby. And if your Lordship had grounded only upon the said information of theirs, I mought and would truly have upholden that few of the matters were justly objected ; as the very circumstances do induce in that they were delivered by men that did misaffect me and besides were to give colour to their own doings. But because your Lordship did mingle therewith both a late motion of mine own and somewhat which you had otherwise heard, I know it to be my duty (and so do I stand affected) rather to prove your Lordship's admonition effectual in my doings hereafter than causeless by excusing what is past. And yet (with your Lordship's pardon humbly asked) it may please you to remember that I did endeavour to set forth that said motion in such sort as it mought breed no harder effect than a denial, and I protest simply before God that I sought therein an ease in coming within Bars, and not any extraordinary and singular note of favour.”

May not the interpretation of the phrase “I sought therein an ease in coming within Bars” be “I sought in that motion a freedom from the burden (or necessity) of coming within Bars.” The phrase “an ease in” is very unusual, and unless it was a term used in connection with the Inns it is difficult to see its precise meaning. In other words, he sought an alternative method to provide means for carrying out his great philosophical enterprise.

There is an interval of five years before the next and last letter of the six was written. It is undated, but an observation in it shows that it was written when he was about 31 years of age, thus fixing the date at 1591.



From an entry in Burghley's note book,\* dated 29 October, 1589, it appears that in the meantime a grant had been made to Bacon of the reversion of the office of Clerk to the Counsel in the Star Chamber. This was worth about £1,600 per annum and executed by deputy, but the reversion did not fall in for twenty years, so it did not affect the immediate difficulty in ways and means.

There are occasional references to Francis in Anthony's correspondence which show that the brothers were residing at Grays Inn, but nothing is stated as to the occupation of the younger brother.

At this time, according to Spedding,† who, however, does not give his authority, Francis had a lodge at Twickenham. Many of his letters are subsequently addressed from it, and three years later he was keeping a staff of scriveners there.

The last letter is addressed to Lord Burghley, and contains the following :—

" I cannot accuse myself that I am either prodigal or slothful, yet my health is not to spend nor my course to get. Lastly, I confess that I have as vast contemplative ends as I have moderate civil ends : for I have taken all knowledge to be my province. This whether it be curiosity or vain glory, or (if one takes it favourably) *philanthropia*, is so fixed in my mind as it cannot be removed. And I do easily see, that place of any reasonable countenance doth bring commandment of more wits than of a man's own, which is the thing I greatly affect. And for your Lordship, perhaps you shall not find more strength and less encounter in any other. And if your Lordship shall find now, or at any time, that I do seek or affect any place, whereunto any that is nearer to your Lordship shall be concurrent, say then that I am a most dishonest man. And if your Lordship will not carry me on, I will not do as Anaxagoras did, who reduced himself with contemplation unto voluntary poverty ; but

\* Cott. MSS. Tit. CX. 93.

† " Life and Letters," Vol. I., p. 110.

this I will do, I will sell the inheritance that I have, and purchase some lease of quick revenue, or some office of gain that shall be executed by deputy, and so give over all care of service and become some sorry bookmaker, or a true pioneer in that mine of truth, which he said lay so deep. This which I have writ to your Lordship is rather thoughts than words, being set down without all art, disguising or reservation."

The suit has been of no avail. Once more Bacon appeals (and this is to be his final appeal) to his uncle. He is writing thoughts rather than words, set down without art, disguising or reservation. But if his Lordship will not carry him along he has definitely decided on his course of action. The law is not now even referred to. If the object of the suit was not stated in 1580, there cannot be much doubt now but that it had to do with the making of books and pioneer work in the mine of truth. For ten years Francis Bacon had waited, buoyed up by encouragements and false hopes. Now he decides to take his fortune into his own hands and rely no more on assistance either from the Queen or Burghley.

One sentence in the letter lifts the veil from the mental attitude of Burghley to his nephew: "If your Lordship shall find now, or at any time, that I do seek or affect any place whereunto any that is nearer unto your Lordship shall be concurrent, say then that I am a most dishonest man." Surely this was an assurance on Bacon's part that he did not seek or affect to stand in the way of the one—the only one, Robert Cecil—who stood nearer to Burghley in kinship.

It therefore appears evident from the foregoing facts:—

(1) That Francis Bacon at 17 years of age was an accomplished scholar; that his knowledge was abnormally great, and that his wit, memory, and mental qualities were of the highest order.

(2) That in the year 1580, when 19 years old, he sought the assistance of Burghley to induce the Queen to supply him with means and the opportunity to carry out some great work upon the achievement of which he had set his heart. The work was without precedent, and in carrying it out he was prepared to dedicate to her Majesty the use and spending of his life.

(3) That for ten years he waited and hoped for the granting of his suit, which was rare and unaccustomed, until eventually he was compelled to relinquish it and rely upon his own resources to effect his object.

(4) But he desired to command other wits than his own, and that could be more easily achieved by one holding place of any reasonable countenance. He therefore sought through Burleigh place accompanied by income, so that he might be enabled to achieve the vast contemplative ends he had in view.

(5) That during the years 1580 to 1597, in which he claims that he was not slothful, there is no evidence of his being occupied in his profession or in State affairs to any appreciable extent, and yet there do not exist any acknowledged works as the result of his labours. Rawley states that Bacon would "suffer no moment of time to slip from him without some present improvement."

(6) He strained the monetary resources of his mother and brother, which were not inconsiderable, to the utmost, exhausted his own, and heavily encumbered himself with debts, and yet he was not prodigal or extravagant.

(7) Money he must have to carry out his schemes, and he therefore decided that, failing obtaining some sinecure office, he would sell the inheritance he had, purchase some lease of quick revenue or office of gain that could be executed by a deputy, give over all care



of serving the State, and become some sorry book-maker or a true pioneer in the mine of truth.

(8) Spedding says, "He could at once imagine like a poet and execute like a clerk of the works"; but whatever his contemplative ends were there is nothing known to his biographers which reveals the result of his labours as clerk of the works.

(9) If he carried out the course of action which he contemplated it is clear that he decided to do so without himself appearing as its author and director. From 1580 to 1590 something more was on his mind than the works he published after he had arrived at sixty years of age. "I am no vain promiser," he said. Where can the fulfilment of his promise be found? Can his course be followed by tracing through the period the trail which was left by some great and powerful mind directing the progress of the English Renaissance?

Before endeavouring to throw light on Francis Bacon's life during the period stated, it is proposed to make some suggestions as to works upon which he was engaged whilst in France, or which are associated with his sojourn there.

Francis Bacon was at Blois with Sir Amias Paulet in 1577. In the same year was published the first edition of the first part of "Académie Françoise par Pierre de la Primaudaye Esceuyer, Seigneur dudict lieu et de la Barrée, Gentilhomme ordinaire de la chambre du Roy." The dedication dated February, 1577 (*i.e.*, 1578) is addressed, "Au Tres-chrestien Roy de France et de Polongne Henry III. de ce nom." The first English translation by T. B. was "published in 1586, imprinted at London by Edmund Bollifant for G. Bishop and Ralph Newbery." Other parts followed at intervals of years, but the first complete edition in English bears date 1618, and was printed for Thomas Adams. Over the dedication is the well-known Archer Emblem. It is a

thick folio volume, with 1,038 pages double columns. It may be termed the first Encyclopædia which appeared in any language, and is perhaps one of the most remarkable productions of the Elizabethan era. Little is known of Pierre de la Primaudaye. The particulars for his biography in the "Biographie Nationale" seem to have been taken from references made to the author in the "French Académie" itself. In the French Edition, 1580, there is a portrait of a man, and under it the words "Anag. de L'auth. Par la prière Dieu m'ayde." The following is an extract from the dedication :—

"The dinner of that prince of famous memorie, was a second table of Salomon, vnto which resorted from euerie nation such as were best learned, that they might reape profit and instruction. Yours, Sir, being compassed about with those, who in your presence daily discourse of, and heare discoursed many graue and goodly matters, seemeth to be a schoole erected to teach men that are borne to vertue. And for my selfe, hauing so good hap during the assemblie of your Estates at Blois, as to be made partaker of the fruit gathered thereof, it came in my mind to offer vnto your Maiestie a dish of diuers fruits, which I gathered in a Platonicall garden or orchard, otherwise called an ACADEMIE, where I was not long since with certaine yong Gentlemen of Aniou my companions, discoursing together of the institution in good maners, and of the means how all estates and conditions may liue well and happily. And although a thousand thoughts came then into my mind to hinder my purpose, as the small authoritie, which youth may or ought to haue in counsell amongst ancient men : the greatnes of the matter subiect, propounded to be handled by yeeres of so small experience : the forgetfulness of the best foundations of their discourses, which for want of a rich and happie memorie might be in me : my iudgement not sound ynough, and my profession vnfit to set them downe in good order : briefly, the consideration of your naturall disposition and rare vertue, and of the learning which you receiue both by reading good authors, and by your familiar communication with learned and great personages that are neere about your Maiestie (whereby I seemed to oppose the light of an obscure day, full of clouds

and darkness, to the bright beames of a very cleere shining sonne, and to take in hand, as we say, to teach Minerua). I say all these reasons being but of too great waight to make me change my opinion, yet calling to mind manie goodlie and graue sentences taken out of sundry Greeke and Latine Philosophers, as also the woorthie examples of the liues of ancient Sages and famous men, wherewith these discourses were enriched, which might in delighting your noble mind renew your memorie with those notable sayings in the praise of vertue and dispraise of vice, which you alwaies loued to heare : and considering also that the bounty of Artaxerxes that great Monarke of the Persians was reuiued in you, who receiued with a cheerfull countenance a present of water of a poore laborer, when he had no need of it, thinking to be as great an act of magnanimitie to take in good part, and to receiue cheerfully small presents offered with a hartie and good affection, as to giue great things liberally, I ouercame whatsoever would haue staid me in mine enterprise."

It appears, therefore, that the author by good hap was a visitor at the Court of Henry III. when at Blois ; that he was there studying with certain young gentlemen of Anjou, his companions ; that he was a youth, and of years of small experience ; that his memory might not be sufficiently rich and happy, his judgment not enough, and his profession unfit in recording the discourses of himself and his companions.

"The Author to the Reader" is an essay on Philosophie, every sentence in which seems to have the same familiar sound as essays which subsequently appeared under another name. The contents of the several chapters are enumerated thus : "Of Man," "Of the Body and Soule," etc.

The first chapter contains a description of how the "Academie" came about. An ancient wise gentleman of great calling having spent the greater part of his years in the service of two kings, and of his country, France, for many and good causes had withdrawn himself to his house. He thought that to content his mind, which always delighted in honest and vertuous things,



he could not bring greater profit to the Monarchie of France, than to lay open and preserve and keep youth from the corruption which resulted from the over great license and excessive liberty granted to them in the Universities. He took unto his house four young gentlemen, with the consent of their parents who were distinguished noblemen. After he had shown these young men the first grounds of true wisdom, and of all necessary things for their salvation, he brought into his house a tutor of great learning and well reported of his good life and conversation, to whom he committed their instruction. After teaching them the Latin tongue and some smattering of Greek he propounded for their chief studies the moral philosophy of ancient sages and wise men, together with the understanding and searching out of histories which are the light of life. The four fathers, desiring to see what progress their sons had made, decided to visit them. And because they had small skill in the Latin tongue, they determined to have their children discourse in their own natural tongue of all matters that might serve for the instruction and reformation of every estate and calling, in such order and method as they and their master might think best. It was arranged that they should meet in a walking place covered over with a goodly green arbour, and daily, except Sundays, for three weeks, devote two hours in the morning and two hours after dinner to these discourses, the fathers being in attendance to listen to their sons. So interesting did these discussions become that the period was often extended to three or four hours, and the young men were so intent upon preparation for them that they would not only bestow the rest of the days, but oftentimes the whole night, upon the well studying of that which they proposed to handle. The author goes on to say :—"During which time it was my good hap to be one of the companie when they

began their discourses, at which I so greatly wondered that I thought them worthy to be published abroad." From this it would appear that the author was a visitor, privileged, with the four fathers and the master, to listen to the discourses of these four young men. But, a little further on the position is changed; one of the four young men is, without any explanation, ignored, and his father disappointed! For the author takes his place, as will be seen from the following extract:—

"And thus all fower of us followed the same order daily until everie one in his course had intreated according to appointment, both by the precepts of doctrine, as also by the examples of the lives of ancient Sages and famous men, of all things necessary for the institution of manners and happie life of all estates and callings in this French Monarchie. But because I knowe not whether, in naming my companions by their proper names, supposing thereby to honour them as indeede they deserve it, I should displease them (which thing I would not so much as thinke) I have determined to do as they that play on a Theater, who under borrowed maskes and disguised apparell, do represent the true personages of those whom they have undertaken to bring on the stage. I will therefore call them by names very agreeable to their skill and nature: the first ASER which signifieth *Felicity*: the second AMANA which is as much to say as *Truth*: the third ARAM which noteth to us *Highness*; and to agree with them as well in name as in education and behaviour. I will name myself ACHITOB which is all one with *Brother of goodness*. Further more I will call and honour the proceeding and finishing of our sundry treatises and discourses with this goodlie and excellent title of Academie, which was the ancient and renowned school amongst the Greek Philosophers, who were the first that were esteemed, and that the place where Plato, Xenophon, Poleman, Xenocrates, and many other excellent personages, afterward called Academicks, did propound & discourse of all things meet for the instruction and teaching of wisdom: wherein we purposed to followe them to our power, as the sequle of our discourses shall make good prooffe."

And then the discourses commence.

The first Quarto of *Love's Labour Lost* was published in 1598, and was the first Quarto upon which the name of Shakespeare was printed. The title-page states that it is "newly corrected and augmented," from which it may be inferred that there was a previous edition, but no copy of such is known. The commentators are in practical agreement that it was probably the first play-written by the dramatist.

There are differences of opinion as to the probable date when it was written. Richard Grant White believes this to be not later than 1588, Knight gives 1589, but all this is conjecture.

The play opens with a speech by Ferdinand :—

" Let Fame that all hunt after in their lives,  
Live registred upon our brazen Tombes,  
And then grace us, in the disgrace of death :  
When spight of cormorant devouring time,  
Th' endeavour of this present breath may buy :  
That honour which shall bate his sythes keene edge,  
And make us heyres of all eternitie.  
Therefore brave Conquerours, for so you are,  
That warre against your own affections,  
And the huge Armie of the worlds desires.  
Our late Edict shall strongly stand in force,  
Navar shall be the wonder of the world.  
Our Court shall be a little Achademe,  
Still and contemplative in living Art.  
You three, Berowne, Doumaine, and Longavill,  
Have sworne for three yeeres terme, to live with me,  
My fellow Schollers, and to keepe those statutes  
That are recorded in this scedule heere.  
Your oathes are past, and now subscribe your names :  
That his owne hand may strike his honour downe,  
That violates the smallest branch heerein :  
If you are arm'd to doe, as sworne to do,  
Subscribe to your deepe oathes, and keepe it to.

Four young men in the French "Academie" associated together, as in *Love's Labour Lost*, to war against

their own affections and the whole army of the world's desires. Dumaine, in giving his acquiescence to Ferdinand, ends:—

“To love, to wealth, to pompe, I pine and die  
With all these living in Philosophie.”

Philosophie was the subject of study of the four young men to the “Academie.”

Berowne was a visitor, for he says:—

“I only swore to study with your grace  
And stay heere in your Court for three yeeres' space.”

Upon his demurring to subscribe to the oath as drawn, Ferdinand retorts:—

“Well, sit you out : go home, Berowne : adue.”

To which Berowne replies:—

“No, my good lord ; I have sworn to stay with you.”

Achitob was a visitor at the Academie in France. There are other points of resemblance, but sufficient has been said to warrant consideration of the suggestion that the French “Academie” contains the serious studies of the four young men whose experiences form the subject of the play.

The parallels between passages in the Shakespeare plays and the French “Academie” are numerous, but they form no part of the present contention. Only one of the Shakespeare commentators makes any reference to the work. The Rev. Joseph Hunter, writing in 1844, points out that the dramatist in *As You Like It*, describing the seven ages of man, follows the division made in the chapter on “The Ages of Man” in the “Academie.”

---

The suggestion now made is that the French “Academie” was written by Bacon, who is repre-



sented in the dialogues as Achitob—the first part when he was about eighteen years of age, that he continued it until, in 1618, the complete work was published; and that it is the work which he designated "*Temporis partus maximus*." In the dedication the author describes himself as a youth of immature experience, but the contents bear evidence of a wide knowledge of classical authors and their works, a close acquaintance with the ancient philosophies, and a store of general information which it would be impossible for any ordinary youth of such an age to possess. But was not the boy who at fifteen years of age left Cambridge disagreeing with the teaching there of Aristotle's philosophy, and whose mental qualities and acquirements provoked as "the natural ejaculation of the artist's emotion" the significant words, "*Si tabula daretur digna animum mallem*," altogether abnormal?

The first edition of the French "Academie" in English appeared in 1586, the second in 1589, the third (two parts) in 1594, the fourth (three parts) in 1602, the fifth in 1614 (all quartos), then, in 1618, the large folio edition containing the fourth part "never before published in English." It appears to have been more popular in England than it was in France. Brunet in his 1838 edition mentions neither the book nor the author, Primaudaye. The question as to whether there was at this time a reading public in England sufficiently wide to absorb an edition in numbers large enough to make the publication of this and similar works possible at a profit will be dealt with hereafter. In anticipation it may be said that the balance of probabilities justifies the conjecture that the issue of each of these editions involved someone in loss, and the folio edition involved considerable loss.

A comparison between the French and English publications points to both having been written by

an author who was a master of each language rather than that the latter was a mere translation of the former. The English version is so natural in idiom and style that it appears to be an original rather than a translation. The marginal notes are in the exact style of Bacon. "A similitude"—"A notable comparison"—occur frequently just as the writer finds them again and again in Bacon's handwriting in volumes which he possesses. The book abounds in statements, phrases, and quotations which are to be found in Bacon's letters and works.

One significant fact must be mentioned. The first letter of the text in the dedication in the first English translation is the letter S. It is printed from a wood block (Fig. I.). Thirty-nine years after (in 1625) when the last edition of Bacon's Essays—and, with the exception of the small pamphlet containing his versification of certain Psalms, the last publication during his life—was printed, that identical wood block (Fig. II.) was again used to print the first letter in the dedication of that book. Every defect and peculiarity in the one will be found in the other. A search through many hundreds of books printed during these thirty-nine years—1586 to 1625—has failed to find it used elsewhere, either then, before, or since.

Did Bacon mark his first and last book by printing the first letter in each from the same block?

---

There is another work which it is impossible not to associate with this period, and that is John Barclay's "Argenis." It is little better known than is the "French Academy," and yet Cowper pronounced it the most amusing romance ever written. Cardinal Richelieu is said to have been extremely fond of reading it and to have derived thence many of his

political maxims. It is an allegorical novel. Barclay's life and the works attributed to him will form the subject of a subsequent article, and it is proposed now only to mention some evidence connected with the "Argenis" which supports the contention that the 1625 English edition contains the original composition and that its author was young Francis Bacon.

The first edition of the "Argenis" in Latin was published in 1621. The authority to the publisher, Nicholas Buon, to print and sell the "Argenis" is dated the 21st July, 1621, and was signed by Barclay at Rome. The Royal authority is dated on the 31st August following.

Barclay's death took place between these dates, on the 12th of August, at Rome. It is reported that the cause of death was stone, but in an appreciation of him, published by his friend Peirese, his death is attributed to poison.

The work is an example of the highest type of Latinity. So impressed was Cowper with its style that he stated that it would not have dishonoured Tacitus himself. A translation in Spanish was published in 1624, and in Italian in 1629.

In a letter dated 11th May, 1622, Chamberlain, writing to Carleton, says: "The King has ordered Ben Jonson to translate the 'Argenis,' but he will not be able to equal the original." On the 2nd October, 1623, Ben Jonson entered a translation in Stationers' Hall, but it was never published. About that time there was a fire in Jonson's house, in which it is said some manuscripts were destroyed; but it is a pure assumption that the "Argenis" was one of these.

In 1629 an English translation appeared by Sir Robert Le Grys, Knight, and the verses by Thomas May, Esquire. The title-page bears the statement: "The prose upon his Majesty's command." There is

a Clavis appended, also stated to be "published at his Majesties command." It was printed by Felix Kyngston for Richard Mughten and Henry Seile. In the address to "The understanding Reader" Le Grys says, "What then should I say? Except it were to entreate thee, that where my English phrase doth not please thee, thou wilt compare it with the originall Latin and mend it. Which I doe not speake as thinking it impossible, but as willing to have it done, for the saving me a labour, who, if his Majesty had not so much hastened the publishing it, would have reformed some things in it, that did not give myselfe very full satisfaction."

In 1622 King James ordered a translation of the "Argenis." In 1629\* Charles I. was so impatient to have a translation that he hastened the publication, thus preventing the translator from revising his work. Three years previously, however, in 1625—if the date may be relied on—there was published as printed by G. P. for Henry Seile a translation by Kingesmill Long. James died on the 25th March, 1625. The "Argenis" may not have been published in his lifetime; but if the date be correct, three or four years before Charles hastened the publication of Le Grys's translation, this far superior one with Kingesmill Long's name attached to it could have been obtained from H. Seile. Surely the publisher would have satisfied the King's impatience by supplying him with a copy of the 1625 edition had it been on sale. The publication of a translation of the "Argenis" must have attracted attention. Is it possible that it could have been in existence and not brought to the notice of the King? There is something here that requires explanation. The Epistle Dedicatorie of the 1625 edition is written in the familiar style of another pen, although it bears the name of Kingesmill Long.

\* One copy of this edition bears the date 1828.



The title-page states that it is "faithfully translated out of Latine into English," but it is not directly in the Epistle Dedicatorie spoken of as a translation. The following extract almost implies that the work had been lying for years waiting publication :—

"This rude piece, such as it is, hath long lyen by me, since it was finished ; I not thinking it worthy to see the light I had always a desire and hope to have it undertaken by a more able workman, that our Nation might not be deprived of the use of so excellent a Story : But finding none in so long time to have done it ; and knowing though it spake not *English*, though it were a rich jewell to the learned Linguist, yet it was close lockt from all those, to whom education had not given more languages, than Native Tongues : I have adventured to become the key to this piece of hidden Treasure, and have suffered myselfe to be overruled by some of my worthy friends, whose judgements I have alwayes esteemed, sending it abroad (though coarsely done) for the delight and use of others."

Not a word about the author ! The translations, said to be by Thomas May, of the Latin verses in the 1629 are identical with those in the 1625 edition, although Kingesmill Long, on the title-page, appears as the translator. Nothing can be learnt as to who or what Long was.

Over lines "Authori," signed Ovv : Fell : in the 1625 edition is one of the well-known light and dark A devices. This work is written in flowing and majestic English ; the 1629 edition in the cramped style of translation.

The copy bearing date 1628, to which reference has been made, belonged to John Henry Shorthouse. He has made this note on the front page : "Jno. Barclay's description of himself under the person of Nicopompus Argenis, p. 60." This is the description to which he alludes :—

"Him thus boldly talking, Nicopompus could no longer endure : he was a man who from his infancy loved Learning ;

but who disdaining to be nothing but a booke-man had left the schooles very young, that in the courts of Kings and Princes, he might serve his apprenticeship in publicke affairs ; so he grew there with an equall abilitie, both in learning and imployment, his descent and disposition fitting him for that kind of life : wel esteemed of many Princes, and especially of Meleander, whose cause together with the rest of the Princes, he had taken upon him to defend."

This description is altogether inaccurate as applied to John Barclay, but in every detail it describes Francis Bacon.

A comparison has been made between the editions of 1625 and 1629 with the 1621 Latin edition. It leaves little room for doubting that the 1625 is the original work. Throughout the Latin appears to follow it rather than to be the leader ; whilst the 1629 edition follows the Latin closely. In some cases the word used in the 1625 edition has been incorrectly translated into the 1621 edition, and the Latin word re-translated literally and incorrectly in view of the sense in the 1629 edition. But space forbids this comparison being further followed ; suffice it to say that everything points to the 1625 edition being the original work.

As to the date of composition much may be said ; but the present contention is that "The French Academie," "The Argenis," and *Love's Labour Lost* are productions from the same pen, and that they all represent the work of Francis Bacon probably between the years 1578 to 1580. At any rate, the first-named was written whilst he was in France, and the others were founded on the incidents and experience obtained during his sojourn there.

WILLIAM T. SMEDLEY.

---

The writer's theory as to the subject of Francis Bacon's suit in 1580, and how he carried through his project without the aid of the Queen or Burghley, is reserved for a future article.

## I CANNOT TELL: SHAKESPEARE, BACON, AND TENNYSON

THE fourth chapter of my book, "Shakespeare Studies in Baconian Light," is entitled "*I Cannot Tell*," and discusses the various uses made of this and equivalent phrases by Bacon and Shakespeare. Let me here add a few additional reflections.

The phrase is applied either to facts for which no evidence, or insufficient evidence, exists, or for abstract ideas which must be believed not by outward evidence but by interior perception—ideas such as Justice, Existence, Equity, Divinity, Government, etc.; or it is playfully used with a sort of dramatic insincerity. In some cases, where it refers to facts not supported by evidence, the equivalent phrase *I cannot judge* is substituted. Thus the "True Tragedy" has *I cannot tell*, but its revised form in 3 *Henry VI.* (II. i. 120), has *I cannot judge*, and a similar change is in *Merry Wives* (I. i. 268).

It should be observed that a deep philosophical axiom is secreted in this phrase, viz., that true philosophy refers not to exterior facts, but to inward ideas; that it rests not on outward perception, but interior apprehensions. This is the axiom of all philosophy, and Bacon assumes it when he makes Wonder (*Admiratio*) the beginning of philosophy; broken knowledge—knowledge, as it were, in embryo—half-made, fragmentary knowledge. Goethe says, "*Das Wunder ist des Glaubens liebstes Kind*"—"Wonder is Faith's dearest Child"; and Plato most poetically expresses the same idea (see "Studies," p. 80). It is an essential assumption of all philosophy, ancient as well as modern. Kant, in his "Kritik der Reinen Vernunft," says that if all that, unknown to outward sight, which "cannot tell," is

apprehended by interior vision, by Reason alone (*Vernunft*) we only reach negative conclusions ; *ex. gr.*, as to the reality of an external world. But he finds the requisite assurance in practical reason, the essential moral nature of man, and here all the dim questions of human nature and destiny find a meaning and reality. Victor Cousin expresses the same idea in the somewhat Brobdignagian sentence, "All subjectivity and reflectivity expires in the spontaneity of apperception"—that is, by inward vision alone do we know what is eternal, and independent of individual life.

Bacon does not formulate any psychology or metaphysic, but one of the fundamental laws of all thought is assumed when he speaks of wonder as broken knowledge, or the beginning of philosophy. Philosophy starts with *I know not—I cannot tell*.

Tennyson has the same trick of speech. Thus, in "In Memoriam" (96) he writes,—

"You say, but with no touch of scorn  
Sweethearted, . . .  
You tell me doubt is devil-born :—  
*I know not.*"

But he *does* know. The formula of philosophical ignorance covers a moral perception which overrides it, for very soon we hear,—

"There lives more faith in honest doubt  
Believe me, than in half the creeds."

And he pictures a wife wedded to a husband busy about strange, and, to her incomprehensible, things (97),—

"She knows not what his greatness is,  
For that, for all, she loves him more.  
Her faith is fixed and cannot move,  
She darkly feels him great and wise,  
She dwells on him with faithful eyes  
'I cannot understand : I love.'"



So that love unlocks a deeper reality than knowledge. This may even apply to pre-natal fact, or almost forgotten past events, in reference to which,—

“The hoarding sense  
Gives out at times (*he knows not whence*)  
A little flash, a mystic hint” (44).

“Who loves knowledge?” he exclaims (114). But  
“Wisdom is greater, coming from a ‘higher hand,’”—

“For she is earthly of the mind ;  
But wisdom heavenly of the soul.”

Here, again, the axiom of philosophic ignorance is contrasted with the vision of spiritual apprehension. Loss of faith, doubt, despair, is silenced by this divine interior voice,—

“A warmth within the heart would melt  
The freezing reason’s colder part,  
And, like a man in wrath, the heart  
Stood up and answered ‘*I have felt.*’”

\* \* \* \* \*  
And what I am beheld again  
*What is and no man understands ;*  
*And out of darkness came the hands*  
*That reach thro’ nature moulding men.”*

It was plain to Bacon, as to all deep thinkers, that love is a truth-organ, and sees what no other eye, either of the body or mind, can discover.

Anyone who wishes to read a most eloquent and exhaustive discussion of the Philosophy of Wonder and Knowledge may refer to Martineau’s “Types of Ethical Theory,” Vol. II. p. 154. He says: “It is a function both of poetry and religion to re-baptise us, when parched up, in floods of wonder, to revive at once and to assuage the thirst. They set things before us again in their first colours, and wipe away the film of custom that made them dead, and re-invest them with the

power they had lost of looking in and finding us. And only in so far as they effect this have they any title to their name. A poetry that becomes imitative, a religion that can only stereotype historic wonders and not touch the heart-weariness of to-day, have become the artificial tank and ceased to be the running waters of life. It is not then without ground that the Greek philosophy laid such stress on this sentiment, and set it at the first approaches of all culture. We wondered before we knew; and must ever wonder again before we can know more." Thus writes one of the greatest philosophers of all time, whose full greatness is not yet sufficiently acknowledged.

R. M. THEOBALD.

---

## BACON'S ARGOSIES AND CONVOY.

BACON'S supreme object in life was that his philosophy should become known, adopted and worked "for the glory of the Creator and the relief of man's estate." This he insists upon over and over again as the key to his career. For this he toiled and schemed, paid court to the great, aimed at high place, and "filled the world with books," as one of his admirers put it. A man of great position has the command of wits, he used to say; that is, he will secure, if he chooses to use great rank and influence that way, that men of parts and learning will adopt and propagate his ideas.

No one knew better than Bacon how liable schemes of philosophy are to become out of date. We have seen in our own day this ever-recurring phenomenon. Not so long ago Mills' logic and associational psychology seemed to hold the field; then came on Herbert Spencer's evolutionary metaphysics. Already they

have faded ; others take their place, to be in their turn shelved for fresher novelties. So it has been from the beginning of philosophical inquiry among the Greeks —so Bacon saw it under his own eyes. As a great thinker and historical writer of recent date has said in one of his thoughtful poems of Bacon's contemporaries :—

“ There were mighty scholars then,  
With the slow, laborious pen,  
Piling up their works of learning,  
Men of solid, deep discerning,  
Widely famous as they taught  
Systems of connected thought,  
Destined for all future ages ;  
Now the cobweb binds their pages ;  
All unread their volumes lie  
Mouldering so peaceably,  
Coffined thoughts of coffined men,  
Never more to stir again  
In the passion and the strife,  
In the fleeting forms of life,  
All their force and meaning gone,  
As the stream of thought flows on.” \*

Not only is this the fate of systems of philosophy which gain credence and wide influence for a time, but Bacon believed, and his own experience had taught him, that the best and profoundest systems either never “ caught on ” at all, or were completely overwhelmed and drowned in the rushing waters of time. A favourite idea of his was that time was like a river, where the weightiest and most valuable things sink and are quite lost, while the lighter and less valuable are floated down through the ages.

He published, in his youth, a compendious statement of his philosophical ideas. He called it “ The Greatest Birth of Time.” Without even a faint flutter of life

\* “ Poems,” by W. E. H. Lecky, p. 27.

it fell stillborn from the press. As a separate treatise it has disappeared. We can only conjecture which of his opuscula most nearly corresponds to, or contains, its main cogitations.

His *magnum opus*, the "Novum Organum," the laboured work of his maturity, which his chaplain, Dr. Rawley, says Bacon wrote out with additions twelve times over, contains, without doubt, all that "The Greatest Birth" had most valuable—that is, the latter is the core and marrow of the former.

Bacon felt sure that in launching and freighting this great argosy, as well as others of equal dimensions, like the "De Augmentis," or of lesser, on the river of time, he had so constructed them, and provided them with a convoy, that neither winds nor waves nor pirates, neither shoals nor rocks nor any other form of destruction, could prevent them coming into port and distributing their precious cargoes to the consignees—the future generations of men to whose welfare, moral and material, he devoted his best powers and energies.

With all his ingenuity and perfection of plan the scheme has not worked so far. The convoy has got separated from its charge. The argosies, though unwrecked, lie stranded. Some of the cargo, no doubt, has been safely delivered. The convoy is still triumphantly afloat—has done, and does, great things in the world of mind; but the combination has proved, hitherto, practically a fiasco, nor is it certain that it will ever prove anything else. It may, however. There are signs that the argosies may be floated, and the convoy return to its original destination and duty; which, if it does, so far from losing the power and fame gained by its roving, they will be increased a thousand-fold, for a curious effect will be that it is the convoy, and not the argosies, possesses the costliest philosophical bales, which cannot be unpacked till convoy and



argosy unite their forces. The keys of many treasure chests on board the convoy are to be found only on board the argosies. In other words, the Shakespeare plays are not only Bacon's device to keep his philosophy living and vigorous, they are themselves an integral portion and the noblest of his great philosophical scheme.

Bacon thought that it would not take many years to discover why these stately crafts put out from port about the same time. He never supposed that his deep-laid plan in this would be laughed to scorn three hundred years after its invention. He intended that the idea should gradually dawn and increase in brightness, till the full light should shine on all with genial and ever-growing productiveness. Thus was his philosophy to insinuate itself into the minds and hearts of men and possess them for ever without strife or contention.

He suspected, indeed, that such would be the delight taken in one part of his twin device that its philosophical lessons might be for a time overlooked. But he felt sure that there would be some who before long would discover for themselves his whole plan and reveal it to others. So he says plainly, when speaking of his secret method.

The accomplices of the myriad-minded concocter of the combination, some of whom are known, were evidently under a solemn pledge of secrecy, so that the plan should be left to work itself out, the great object being that all prejudice and opposition to the supremacy of his all-embracing philosophy should be avoided. Historical circumstances interfered with the due development of the plot and have hitherto almost completely thwarted the author's intentions in the interlacement of his philosophical and poetical works, the latter in this connection being, *par excellence*, the Shakespeare dramas.

It is impossible to say whether the true solution of the Shakespeare problem will ever now force itself on an incredulous world. But this much is sure—there will be henceforth an ever-increasing number of students who will find in it the most interesting subject of investigation presented by ancient or modern literature.

There is a beautiful passage in Dr. Theobald's "Shakespeare Studies in Baconian Light" (p. 125) which suggests the idea put forward in this article, namely, the rationale of the linked battalions of the "Novum Organum," the "De Augmentis," the third part of the "Instauratio Magna" and the Shakespeare plays, is this very linking and interlacing, for the purpose of endowing the author's philosophy with immortal life and vigour. This is the *Filum Labyrinthi*, the golden "clue that threads the maze."

Dr. Theobald writes:—"In all these cases and in countless others we find a philosophic, scientific, prosaic statement of the principles which live and act in the Shakespearean drama. Comparing Shakespeare's art with Bacon's philosophy we find that

'The art and practic part of life  
Must be the mistress to this theoric.'

(Henry V., I. i. 51).

"In the language of mystic philosophy Shakespeare's art is the continent and ultimate of Bacon's philosophy; there is a perfect correspondence and continuity between them. As the natural world is created by influx from the spiritual world and is its counterpart and representative, so is the poetry of Shakespeare poured forth as influx from the creative thought of Bacon's science, giving to it a concrete presentation, a living, organised counterpart."

To sum up, as soon as ever it was found out that the Shakespeare plays belonged to the Baconian philosophy, that the master of English prose was also the master of

English poetry, Bacon felt sure that his philosophy, all his wisdom provided for the healing of human ills, moral as well as physical, would become not only a classic heritage for all time, but would live among men everywhere with ever-increasing vigour and all-embracing influence. He believed that his writings of every kind—letters, essays, treatises, philosophical tomes, poetry—would be studied, sifted, ransacked for the purpose of an ever-growing proof (“Truth can never be confirmed enough, though doubt did ever sleep”) of the wonder that what he believed to be the greatest triumph of philosophy, and what the world recognizes as among the very greatest triumphs of poetry, were the product of one “brain cut with many facets,” both forming one stupendous whole, to which he had given the title of “*Instauratio Magna Scientiarum*,” the great renovation of learning.

WILLIAM A. SUTTON, S.J.

---

## GHOST IN HIS OWN HAMLET.

ROWE'S “Life of Shakespeare,” 1709, was a clever piece of fooling written to prolong the Stratford myth and continue the elderly Betterton and actor folk upon a false scent. Its frontispiece is a woodcut of the Stratford effigy made to look even more stupid than that placed by Sir W. Dugdale in his “*Antiquities of Warwickshire*.” A wool-sack, borne upon the knees of the player, is a covert allusion to the accustomed seat of Bacon when Lord Chancellor. The cherubs on the canopy hold an hour-glass and a spade, indicating the revelations of time coupled with research. The innuendo about wool is continued in the letterpress. The father of Shakespeare is alleged to have been a considerable dealer in wool,

"and was able to give his son no better education than his own employment."

The son William "was bred for some time at a free school, where it is probable he acquired what Latin he was master of." "The need for his assistance at home prevented his further proficiency in that language." These passages are elaborations of the "small Latin" and "less Greek" jocosity of Ben Jonson.

Rowe's next jocularly is to argue that because the works are not interspersed with passages copied out from classical authors, *ergo*, Shakespeare evidently did not know them!

"We scarce find any traces of anything that looks like an imitation of the Ancients."

The next extract from Rowe will best be appreciated by those familiar with what is current as to the player's early career.

"For ought I know the performances of his youth, as they were the most vigorous, and the most fire and strength in them, were the best."

Rowe, "though he had inquired," could only ascertain that the "top of Shakespeare's performance was that of Ghost in his own *Hamlet*." Sir E. Durning Lawrence, in his recent book "Bacon is Shakespeare," has, I think, not quite appreciated the humorous use of the capital letters.

The point which Rowe was covertly concealing was that at a particular date in his career the player was employed to serve the true author of the plays by retiring to his village (hamlet) and becoming "ghost," or vizard for plays which were in his absence to be ascribed to his authorship.

Three other players, namely, Peele, Greene and Marlowe, had done similarly some years before, which consequently gave to this subsequent ascription some "colour of truth." Rowe never went to Stratford, and

it is manifest that in taking his few particulars from old Betterton, omitting mention of the sonnets, misstating the player's children, misquoting Mr. Hales, of Eton, asserting a Jonson incident which never occurred, and in other ways dissembling, his intention was merely further to perpetuate the myth.

The immediate purpose of this article is to review as far as possible the circumstances which led to and followed the player's retirement to his own hamlet and fulfilment of his office of "ghost" for the true author.

The manuscripts listed upon the Northumberland House cover seem to have been placed within the cover in the order in which they were prepared or fair copied. They begin with orations for Grays Inn Revels (1593—4), followed by speeches for the Tilt Yard Device (17th November, 1595); orations for Grays Inn Revels (1596—7); essays (printed 30th January, 1597—8); play of *Richard II.* (entered S.R., 29th August, 1597); play of *Richard III.* (entered S.R., October, 1597); *Isle of Dogs* (fragment of a play). An unknown play, perhaps never performed, *Asmund and Cornelia*, is also on the list, as is also a copy, doubtless made for Bacon's reference, of the libel circulated in MS. about his father, the Earl of Leicester, but not printed until 1641.

The fragment of the *Isle of Dogs* play would seem to have been written last, and in view of his brother Robert's expedition to the Acores, or Isle of Hawks, projected early in the year, Francis would appear under this title to have written in the invective style (usually put forth under the vizard of his assistant Nash) some caustic comments on matters of State put into dramatic form.

Doubtless for good reasons he did not finish the play, but gave it to some players at a Bankside play-house to finish and use if they thought fit.

The result was a debacle. The pseudo author and



other actors were put in the Fleet prison, the play was alleged to be "seditious and schlanderous," and all play-acting was summarily stopped by order of the Privy Council.

Not until February, 1597—8 were players' licenses renewed, and then only to two companies—the Lord Admiral's and the Lord Chamberlain's—that they might be the better qualified to appear before the Queen. Essex and his bosom friend Southampton had returned to England at the end of October, 1597, to find that Howard, the Lord Steward, one of the Queen's oldest councillors and her close personal friend, had been created Earl of Nottingham, which gave him precedence at Court, and to find also that Robert Cecil had obtained the vacant office of Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster. Essex left the Court in high dudgeon, and did not return until after 18th of December, when the Queen had restored his precedence by creating him Earl Marshal of England.

The plays of *Richard II.* and *Richard III.* were due for printing this year, and between August, 1597, and 25th of March, 1597—8 were in fact printed in quarto. Sound reason existed for keeping back the *Richard II.* play until a favourable moment. There was sure to be trouble about it. If the old Queen was "touched" on any subject it was on that of *Richard II.* Since her late cousin, Lord Hunsdon, had given her that title because she shared with Richard II. his love of flattery, any allusion to that deceased monarch was believed by the old lady to be directed against her. (In 1601 she assured Lamparde that she *was* Richard II.). The 1597 quarto of *Richard III.* was probably first published. At Christmas, 1597—8, an old play, *Love's Labour Lost*, had been performed for the Queen's amusement (refurnished with jokes at the expense of her recent visitor, Don Antonio Perez). Stage playing elsewhere in London was prohibited.

Francis Bacon occupied himself with publishing a few essays. Howard having retired to his country seat, and Cecil being in France, the Essex party arranged to have a special entertainment amongst themselves at Essex House on 14th February, and evidently *Richard II.* was one of the two plays then staged. Francis Bacon was no party to this. The play was rushed on to the stage and into print against his judgment. The haste accounts for the fact that the 1597 quarto *Richard II.* is about the only important Shakespeare quarto which has no cipher in it. In his Charge against Oliver St. John, Bacon remarked, "And for your comparison of Richard II. I see you follow the example of them that brought him upon the stage and into print in Queen Elizabeth's times." *Richard III.* may have been the other play performed that day; the point is not very material, but seeing that it indirectly attacked the deformed and absent Cecil, it may well have been presented. The anonymous quartos of 1597 of these two plays (*Richard II.* being without the deposition scene) were printed very likely for distribution amongst the Essex faction.

Francis Bacon seems to have taken prompt action to provide in advance against the trouble he anticipated would arise from the Essex House manifestations.

He paid the player Shakspeare a substantial sum to leave London, retire to his own hamlet, and meantime allow plays to be ascribed to his authorship. This was evidently done in January, as in the following month the player is recorded as a householder at Stratford. Moreover, the tradition that Southampton helped in finding the money—may have found it all—is consistent with a payment in January, as he could not have done so later, being sent away with Cecil to France in February. Southampton, from his long association with Francis and Robert, was closely com-

mitted to the Essex faction, and owing to his relations with Elizabeth Vernon, one of the Queen's maids of honour, was in daily expectation of trouble with the Queen.

Bacon's next step was to put the current plays upon the new footing. New quartos of *Richard II.* and *Richard III.* were published having upon their title-pages the added words, "By William Shakespeare."

One can almost imagine one of Bacon's men, careful of paper, scribing the new name upon the cover of the Northumberland MS. before writing it on a 1597 quarto of each of the Richard plays intended for printers' "coppies of the title-paged new editions."

The Christmas play of *Love's Labour Lost* was printed in quarto in 1598 as "newly corrected and augmented by Wm. Shakespeare," and the old play of *Henry IV.* was printed in 1598 as "newly corrected by Wm. Shakespeare."

The bulk ascription to Shakespeare of the other unfathered plays was neatly effected by a pamphlet issued in the name of Francis Meres in October, 1598. Florio was one of Bacon's assistants, Meres perhaps another. He married Florio's sister. Ben Jonson may have had some reasons in 1616 for associating Shakspeare as one of the actors of his (Jonson's) plays, but he was away in 1598, as the Stratford records and the Quayney and Sturley letters show, and could not have taken part in *Every Man in His Humour*, and he certainly never played in *Every Man Out of His Humour*, in which he was lampooned as Sogliardeo.

Sir E. Durning Lawrence has well shown how Jonson, in the last-named play, ridiculed the grant to Shakespeare of a coat of arms.

It was probably one of the inducements offered for his retirement to enact the part of "Ghost in His Own Hamlet" that he should be made an esquire.

"They purchase lands and now esquires are made."

*Return from Parnassus.*

Dethick and Camden, the Heralds, however, took care to so "trick" his coat of arms that not only the man himself should be fooled, but one of his biographers after him. The coat shows a field of *gold*. Upon it a speare, bending sinister. The crest, a ridiculous fowl, holds another speare rampant. The rampant speare is made to point to an obvious gap between the words of the motto above, which thus reads, "Non. Sans Droict," which, being interpreted, means "Nought. Without Right." (See Lee's "Life of Shakespeare.")

When will the little confederacy who know of Bacon's authorship and Shakspeare's ghostship make their long overdue "authoritative pronouncement"?

Amongst the poets Ben Jonson knew it in 1623, Milton in 1632, Rowe in 1709, and Pope in 1741. The face of the statue in the Abbey memorial to Shakespeare (which Pope was concerned in erecting) is manifestly copied from Van Somer's portrait of Bacon. The secret passed to Pope's successors is rapidly becoming one no longer.

"Story, good Sirs, there will be none to tell."

PARKER WOODWARD.

## BACON IN FRANCE.

SOME confusion exists with regard to the dates of Francis Bacon entering and leaving Cambridge, and being sent to Paris. The following facts ought to set the matter at rest.

Cooper's *Athehæ Cantabrigienses* says: "On April 5th, 1573, he [Anthony] and his younger brother Francis began to reside at Trinity college as fellow-commoners. . . . The brothers, who had been absent from college on account of the plague from August, 1574, till March following, left Cambridge at Christmas, 1575."

Thus Francis entered Cambridge at twelve, and left it just before his fifteenth birthday. He kept six terms and lost two. Mr. Amyas Paulet, who had administered his duties with zeal in Jersey, and there shown hospitality to Huguenot refugees, had just been knighted, and appointed English Ambassador for a short time at the Court of Henri III. in the place of Dr. Dale. To Paulet and his good wife Margaret, Francis was entrusted, when, as Rawley, his biographer, says: "His father thought fit to frame and mould him for the Arts of State, and for that end sent him over to France with Sir Amyas Paulet, then employed Ambassador Lieger into France, by whom he was after a while held fit to be entrusted with some message or advertisement to the Queen."

Paulet landed at Calais on 25th September, 1576,\* though he did not take up his appointment till February, 1577. By which facts we see that Francis was hurried off abroad, and had barely time—eight months—in which to blossom forth from a sober-clad Cambridge scholar into a full-blown Courtier, with all the exquisite

\* Copy-book of Sir Amyas Paulet's Letters in British Museum.



fripperies of trunk hose, perfumed leather gloves and boots, and delicate starched ruffs, and all the finery suited to an attaché at the great Protestant Queen's Embassy.

Rawley relates that Francis accomplished some work political given him to do "with great approbation," and that the young envoy "returned back to France again, with intention to continue for some years there."

During the two years of Paulet's Ambassage he wrote three letters to the Lord Keeper, interesting because they each allude, though all too briefly, to Francis. I quote them at length.

#### LETTERS.

"From Register or Copy Book of Sir Amyas Poulet during his Embassy in France in 1577. Edited by Octavius Ogle, M.A., and Printed for the Roxburghe Club."

On the Fly leaf of Title page is printed as follows :

"(This was made some use of by Mr Blackbourne in his collection relating to Lord Bacon given by me to Dr Rawlinson ; but coming to his brother's hands he knew not how he desired me to restore it, which I did at the Dr's return from abroad, 1726. It was my Grandfather's book J. Locker)." (Rawl : A.331).

#### PREFACE.

"Of the MS. herein edited the account given in Macray's Catalogue of Rawl : MSS. A.331 is as follows :

"'Codex Chartacens in folio ff.130. A full account of the volume is given in the Collection of John Blackbourne (a bishop among the non-jurors) prefixed to his edition of Bacon's Works. . . . One letter to Queen Eliz., dated 6th August, 1577, is printed in Murdin's Collection of State Papers folio, London, 1759, p. 305. Part of this, occupying from p. 308 to 312 in the printed copy, is wanting in this MS. Three leaves have also been torn out after fol. 54, two after fol. 80, and part of a letter is wanting before fol. 32.' Dr. Blackbourne's account of the volume is this : 'The papers from which I have transcribed the foregoing letters seem to be protocols or registers of Sir Amyas Powlet during a considerable part of his embassy in France.

They commence May 22, 1577, and conclude on the 10th of Jan. following. . . ."

"TO MY LORD KEEPER.

"My very good Lord, Unlesse yt shall please your Lordship to deale better with me then I have deserved I shall hardly excuse myself towards you that I have not troublid you more often of late with my lettres ; and because your Lordship shall knowe the great hope which I have conceavyd of your good opinion of me, leaving all manner of excuse, I will presume to assuer my self that you will not impute this fault to want of good will, and upon this assuerance I am bold to present your Lordship with these fewe lynes, and by the same to advertise you that your sonne, thanks be to God, is in good health, and other good newes your Lordship may not looke to heare out of these parts, where there is no end of all kindes of myschiefs and miseries. Nothing is remitted that may serve for the recovery of Brouage, neyther is there any other great action in hand att this presente in this parte of France, and some men think that the successe of this siege will not be very happie for those of the King's partie. The Duc Montpensier and the other comysioners are yet with the King of Navare, where they treat of peace, and here it is given out that this peace comyth this daye and tomorrowe and I cannot tell when, and in dede some thinke France will not be so happie this yeare. The Duc of Guise is gone towards Champaigne to provide for the Reistres, and some saye the King will not be longe from Paris. Dampnill dothe no great thing in Languedoc, and the Army which Mons<sup>r</sup>. had in Auvergne ys nowe ydle. And thus leaving to trouble your Lordship, I comytt you to the mercyfull protection of the Almightye."

[From Poitiers. Undated. But a letter before it is dated July, 1577.]

---

"My Verie good Lord, I trust your Lordship will thinke no lewdness in me that I have not troubled you more often with my letters. Wherein I would have used greater diligence, yf I had not presumed of youre Lordship's good opinion of me, which I trust to be so well grounded, that you will not condemne for this negligence and shall most humblie pray yr Lordship to thinke that when I write I am wholie at yr Lordship's commandement, and when I do not write I am the same. Your Lordship's

absence from the Court and London duringe this tyme of vacation, hathe been the principall cause of my slaknes.

"The actions of hostilitie in these partes are utterlie ceased, the peace beinge concluded between the kinge and his subjects. God graunt yt be don with soche synceritie, as become the word, promise, and oathe of an annoyted King! This Peace is received with great joy, and great hope is conceived of contynueance thereof. The King will have the honor of this Peace, and sayeth yt ys a Peace of his owne makinge and he will keepe yt. And now the eyes of this contrey are all tourned uppon the troubles of the Low Contreyes, but what course the Frenche will take in this matter is not yet certaine lie knowen. This quiet time doth give me no occasion to trouble your Lordship with longe lettres, onlie I must tell you that I reioice moche to se that your Sonne, my companion, hathe, by the Grace of God, passed the brunt and perill of this journey, whereof I ame the more gladd, because in the begynninge of these last troubles yt pleased your Lordship to referr his contynueance with me to my consyderation. I thanke God these dangers are past, and your sonne is safe, sound, and in good healthe, and worthie of your fatherlie favoure. And thus," etc.

[Not dated. But one before it is dated September 24th,  
1577. *Poictiers.*]

---

"TO MY LORD KEEPER.

"My very good Lord, Although I know no new matter worthie of advertisement, yet, this bearer Mr. Duncombe repairing into England, I would not fayle to trouble your Lordship with these fewe lines, to signifie by the same my dutyfull good will towards you. The Low Countries are the subject of the Councell's dyliberations and actions of the Frenche at this tyme, Mons<sup>r</sup>. De Vaux being here from Don John and the Baron Dobignie from the Estates, companies of frenche soldiers are hired dayly, with outward pretence to serve Don John, who expecte the great forces out of Italy, and preparethe for a sharpe and deadly warre. I may not omitt to commend unto your Lordship the honest, diligent, discreet and faithful service of this bearer, which deserveth verie good acceptation, thinking him worthie of the government of your Lordship's sonne, or of anie gentleman in England, of what degree so ever. I cannot tell if your

Lordship be more indebted unto him for his carefulness in your service then I am for his good and quiet behaviour in my house. And thus," etc.

[Not dated. A previous letter was dated October 30th, 1577.]

Francis was what we should technically call now-a-days psychic. As his father, Sir Nicholas Bacon, the Lord Keeper, lay a-dying at the end of February, 1579, Francis, in a vision of the night, saw his father's house in Hertfordshire all plastered over with black mortar—a solemn warning of his father's approaching end. The young envoy went off to England soon after the death, and saw after his affairs. It is not distinctly stated whether after that especial sad occasion he returned to France or not. In a great many Biographies his "travels" are spoken of. In an early Biography,\* earlier than an English one, the French author speaks of Bacon's travels in Spain and Italy. Lake Williams, in his "Historical and Topographical Description of Ancient Verulam (1822)," says: "He [Francis] went abroad to make, not a study of languages only, but to acquire a knowledge of the habits, customs, and manners of the people who spoke them, of the character of their princes, the nature of their lands, and of the constitution of their several governments. In proof of this there is extant in a work a paper of observations on the general state of Europe written by him at nineteen, discovered by his biographer, Dr. Mallet." Spedding says (Vol. I., p. 8): "Amyas Paulet sent a dispatch to the Queen by Francis Bacon, 20th March, 1578-9, saying he was 'of great hope, endued with many and singular parts.' One who, 'if God gave him life, would prove a very able and sufficient subject to do Her Highness good and acceptable service'; adding a most significant remark:

\* A preface to "Histoire Naturelle."

'During the next year, during which we have no further news of him, he was not bound to any vocation in Gray's Inn.' " Poulet's dispatch, if sent 20th March, 1579, would have accompanied Francis home after his father's death, for eighteen days was about the time a journey to and from Paris took in those days. We know from Nichol's "Progress," Vol. I., p. 226, that Lord Derby passed from London to Gravesend, 26th January, 1584, where, taking post-horses, they rid to Sittingbourne, and from thence to Dover, and landed at Calais 1st February, arriving at Paris for the Investiture of Henry III. with the Order of the Garter 13th February; and, travelling home from Boulogne to Dover, he left Paris 28th February, reaching England 12th March.

Elizabeth had work for her envoy to do on the continent of Europe, and it was a matter of moment who should be his escort. Someone not too well affected to Rome; on the other hand, not too dangerous or suspicious a schismatic. Amyas Paulet had returned to England October, 1579; who was to be bear-leader?

Charles Knight, in his edition of Bacon's "Essays" and "Advancement," says: "Poulet entrusted him with an important commission to the Queen, which demanded secrecy and promptitude. He acquitted himself with success, and then returned to continue his tour on the continent." When he returned Amyas was off home, and until anything confutes my theory I shall believe that it was with his brother Anthony's friend, Michael D'Eyquem de Montaigne, Francis journeyed.

In his Essay "On Travel" he says: "Travel in the younger sort is a part of education. . . . That young men travel under some tutor, or grave servant, I allow well, so that he be such a one that hath the language and hath been in the country before, whereby he may be able to tell them what things are worthy to



be seen in the country where they go . . . for else young men shall go hooded, and look abroad little." This certainly Francis did not do; it was to "look abroad" he went.

Francis says in the same Essay, "Let Diaries . . . be brought in use." A Diary, said to be Montaigne's during a journey he made through France and Italy at this time, was found one hundred and eighty years after in a chest at Montaigne. "Let him also keep a Diary" is the reiterated advice of Francis in the Essay. We may infer that when he travelled he kept one.

The Diary known as Montaigne's is written in the third person in French till the party travelling reached Rome. It is said that the secretary of the Mayor of Bordeaux, a *Monsr. Caselis* or *Cazelis*, took it down from Montaigne's dictation. So the tale goes. At or near Lucca the Diary commences to be written in Italian, when it is said Montaigne took up the pen himself. The Italian part of the tour I propose to discuss on another occasion; in this paper I shall confine myself to the French one. The Diary begins on 5th September, 1580, with the addition to Montaigne's party of a youth and his suite at Beaumont-sur-Oise, north of Paris. Montaigne's party consisted of himself and secretary, his brother, Monsr. de Mattecoulon, and Monsr. de Hautoy. There seem to have been many of this name, and who this particular one was is not known. It is more curious that the young man of rank of the name of *d'Esstissac*, who joined them at Beaumont, and divided the expenses of the whole party with his *cortège* of a gentleman, a valet, two lacqueys, two muleteers, and a mule, is not identified. Young men of rank, at that time, more often than not went abroad under other names for motives of safety, and one is inclined to ask, was *d'Esstissac* his real name? seeing that he preceded Mons. de Montaigne wherever

they went, whether at the audience accorded them by the Pope in Rome, or in the Villas of the great Dukes of Tuscany and Ferrara.

This same young d'Esstissac carried letters of introduction to the d'Estes and Medicis from the Court at Paris. That he was a young scholar may be inferred by the Pope's words to him about his studies.

To put the matter plainly, I am inclined to think that Francis Bacon obtained the advantage of the Mayor of Bordeaux' protection on rather a dangerous journey which he undertook for educational and political purposes, taking the name of d'Esstissac, whose identity has never been satisfactorily traced.

From Beaumont the party went to little, beautiful Meaux. The Diary notes a wonderful box-tree in a garden of other curiosities. Meaux interests this writer as having withstood the attacks of Henry V. of England. "They point out in the Marne an island, two or three hundred feet in length, which they say was a horseman thrown into the water by the English to make a platform from which the fortress of the Marche might be bombarded by their engines of war, and which since has become firm ground" (Diary). Henry V. of England lodged with numbers of his people in Meaux after the English had successfully besieged it.

Chalons, Vitri, Bar-le-duc, Vacouleur, and Dom-remy-sur-Meuse each their stopping-place. Dom-remy seems to have also interested the writer of the Diary. "Where was born," he says, "the famous *Pucelle d'Orleans*. Her family was afterwards ennobled by the King, who made a grant of arms which was shown to us, azure with a straight sword crowned, and with a golden hilt, and two fleurs-de-lis in gold beside the sword." And, again, "The front of the little house where she was born is all painted with her feats, but the colour is much decayed through age. There is also a tree beside

a vineyard which they call *L'Arbre de la Pucelle*, but there is nothing remarkable about it."

Mr. Bompas says *Henry V.* was written 1596; *Henry VI.* was produced 1591—the date of its authorship is not known.

Neufchâteau, Mirecourt, Epinal, and the Baths of Plommieres came next. Hills close these round. "The Queen's Bath" and the hot and cold medicinal springs reminding us of our Bath. The journey through Lorraine and Alsace to *Basel*, and the portion of it through Savoie back to Perigord presents nothing of importance. But Francis' stay with the French Court, together with Paulet, at Blois, Tours, and Poitiers, and now this visit, as I believe, to Domremy, should be considered.

Blois was *La Pucelle's* camp, which she kept clean and orderly; from Blois she marched to Orleans. At Tours her armour was made, and her standard. Buried behind the altar of St. Catharine's Church at Fierbois, near Chinon, her sword was dug up—the sword which was said to be Charlemagne's.

It was at Poitier that *La Pucelle* was badgered by the learned doctors of its university. In alluding to Joan of Arc it will be seen I use the title by which she is called both in Shake-Speare and in Montaigne's Diary—" *La Pucelle*."

Our English city of Bath was practically re-built and once more renowned for its medicinal waters, in Queen Elizabeth's reign. She granted it a charter in 1590, and visited it in 1591. Roomy mansions were built there about that time, with ample accommodation for residents and spare rooms for distinguished guests. The Abbey House was the palace of the resident physician, Dr. Sherwood, who took patients as "paying guests."

Now the interesting thing is that it was a physician of Tours, *Jean de Villula*, who again brought Bath into

notice after the old Roman days. He bought the old baths, and the town, etc., from King Rufus, and it were well worth the while of some Baconian to unearth *Jean de Villula's* MSS. at Tours, and to make research there. Was Francis, the lover of the Art of Cure, with his experience of foreign baths and waters after his stay in Tours, Plommières, and Lucca, instrumental in making Bath once more famous, stimulated by Jean de Villula's example? Queen Anne of Denmark patronised Bath, and gave the name of Queen's Bath, like its prototype in Plommières, to a new one built in James's reign.

I wish I were able to conclude this paper with any account of Francis in Strasburg. I have already stated\* my belief that he was there for a time with John Sturmius, the schoolmaster and diplomatist friend of Queen Elizabeth.

We adjourn our study of Montaigne's Diary at the point where the party crossed Alsace to Bale, urging Baconians to bear in mind that Francis, according to Spedding, at this date (27th September, 1580) "was not bound to any vocations in Gray's Inn."

ALICIA AMY LEITH.

## NOTES.

**M**R. WILLIAM ARCHER is imperilling his reputation for impartiality by his attitude with reference to the Bacon controversy. He will not argue about it. He follows in the footsteps of the men of letters and indiscriminately denounces all Baconians. His last effusion needs reproducing; it is so very convincing. Mr. Archer, discoursing on "Things in General" in the *Morning Leader* of the

17th of December, gives his views upon the open mind. There is one subject to which he refuses the right of investigation with an open mind, and he does so in the following choice sentences :—

Finally, I would note another limitation to the ideal of the open mind. There are certain questions on which we cannot safely keep our minds open, because we know that that way madness lies. I once spent a whole day at Concord, Mass., arguing with a friend who had become a convert to astrology and was bent on drawing my horoscope. To that I had no objection ; but I cannot pretend that my mind was for a moment open to his arguments. Somewhat more difficult is the case of the Bacon-Shakespeare theory. Ought we to keep an open mind on that ? I am inclined to answer, " No ; for if we once lose grip of the fact that the whole thing is an insanity, we are in danger of being submerged in a swirling torrent of 'folie lucide.' " The origin and psychological conditions of the illusion are perfectly plain. It is, indeed, one of the oddest and most instructive incidents in the history of the human error, and in that sense worthy of study. Poor Bacon has been forced, by no fault of his own, into the position of the Tichborne Claimant of literature, and one cannot but wonder what he would think of the Onslows, Whalleys, and Kenealys who are pleading what they believe to be his cause. But a really " open mind " on the question is, I conceive, a symptom of an exorbitant love of the marvellous and an imperfect hold upon the reality of things. There are subjects on which no mind can remain open without in some degree losing its balance.

Time will prove whether independent thought is justifiable. Mr. Archer may be right. In the meantime, the controversy will proceed, in spite of this attempt to apply the closure.

---

It is stated that the Shakespeare-Bacon question is catching on with the French, who delight in discussions of the sort. A writer in a paper published at Frankfort-on-the-Main states that it has been held by some that Shakespeare was in reality a Frenchman, a native of the old province of Burgundy, and that his family was settled of old in the French province, but was exiled after the civil wars. The author of the statement says he has evidence of the fact which is conclusive and exact, and that anyone who has read his works can see that the divine bard was inspired by the good wine of Burgundy. This critic repeats a conjecture



made by Mr. Edwin Reed—that the name was originally “Jacques Pierre.” In another paragraph which appears those interested in the subject are invited to communicate with a gentleman whose name and address are given.

---

There is a large literature in France dealing with Bacon's philosophy. More books have been published in French on Bacon and his works than in English. It is curious, however, that the suggested Baconian authorship of the Shakespeare plays and poems has aroused little interest and discussion. There is abundant testimony from Shakespearean authorities that the author was an adept in the French language. Richard Grant White asserts that he had knowledge of even the most delicate peculiarities of the French tongue, whilst Professor Baynes in the “*Encyclopædia Britannica*” says that evidence of this knowledge is so abundant as hardly to need express illustration.

---

It is very certain that Francis Bacon possessed this knowledge. France was the first foreign country which he visited. Whilst he was there, Thomas Bodley wrote to him a letter of advice as to the subjects to which his attention should particularly be directed during his travels. He said: “In the story of France you have a large and pleasant field in three lines of their kings, to observe their alliances and successions, their conquests, their wars especially with us; their Councils, their treaties; and all rules and examples of experiences and wisdom, which will be lights and remembrances to you hereafter, to judge of all occurrences both at home and abroad.” To the thoroughness with which he followed this advice his works testify.

---

The Bacon-Shakespeare controversy continues to obtain prominence in the correspondence columns of the Press. Sir Edwin Durning Lawrence has been ubiquitous, but it has been the *Saturday Review* and the *Pall Mall Gazette* which have received his most

important contributions. Writing in the latter paper on the 11th of November, he issued the following challenge:—

“I hereby offer one hundred guineas to anyone who can construct either in Latin or in English another sensible anagram from the long word\* which shall give the numbers 136 and 151.”

The challenge was accepted by a number of the readers, but only two of them observed the second of the two conditions, namely, that the numerical value of the first and last letters of each word in the anagram should total 136, and the remaining letters 151. In this computation i and j must be regarded as one letter, also u and v.

The Editor of the *Pall Mall Gazette* obtained the assistance of the Rev. James Gow, LL.D., the headmaster of Westminster School, who consented to act as umpire. This is his award:—

The word “sensible” varies considerably in meaning according to its application. An anagram, I take it, is “sensible” when it re-arranges given letters into a word which has a meaning, or into words which, *taken together*, have a meaning. It is not sufficient that the anagram should produce several words, each of which means something, if the words when put together have no continuous meaning.

On this principle I regard Sir E. Durning-Lawrence's anagram as not sensible. His Latin words, though each has a meaning, do not make the meaning which he attributes to them or any other meaning. The only possible translation of “Hi ludi F. Baconis nati tuiti orbi” is “These games sons of F. Bacon having protected (are) orphans.”

On the same principle I rule out Mr. Beevor's second anagram: “It is in nut. I diabolic author fib.” These words do not make a continuous sense. Here are two sentences between which a connection is hardly imaginable.

Mr. Gilson's “I, Jonson hi libri tui aut ficti a d—” is “sensible,” *i.e.*, it may legitimately bear the meaning “Go to Jonson: these books are either yours or invented by the devil,” but the final dash (—) is probably essential to this meaning, and there is no dash in the given letters. Mr. Beevor's “Abi inivit F. Bacon Histrio ludit” is also “sensible”; *i.e.*, it may legitimately bear the meaning, “Be off F. Bacon, the actor, has entered and is playing,” and various other arrangements of the same Latin words would also make sense. Both Mr. Gilson and Mr.

\* Honorificabilitudinitatibus.

Beevor have given simple rules for deriving the numbers 136 and 151 from their Latin words, and here I should observe that, in assigning numbers to the letters of the alphabet, they omit J., as Sir E. Durning-Lawrence also does.

On the whole, I think Sir E. Durning-Lawrence ought to pay Mr. Beevor, but that he has some ground for not paying Mr Gilson.

(Signed) J. Gow.

19, Dean's Yard, S.W.

Upon the award being given Sir Edwin, who had deposited his cheque with the Editor, like a thorough sportsman as he is, authorized him to hand over the same to Mr. Beevor, although still standing by the correct Latinity of the anagram which he had put forward.

Mr. H. B. Irving has ventured on the expression of an opinion as to what seems to him the *reductio ad absurdum* of the value of a cryptogram in argument. In the *Saturday Review*, writing from the Theatre Royal, Dublin, on the 20th of October, 1910, he cites, as if it were a recent discovery of Professor Tyrrell, of Trinity College, Dublin—an instance of which has been published over and over again. It is as follows :—

The first Authorised Version of the Psalms was completed in the year 1610. In that year Shakespeare, born in 1564, was forty-six years of age. If you turn to the 46th Psalm in the Authorised Version you will find that, if you reckon forty-six words from the first word of the Psalm, you come to the word "shake." If you count forty-six backwards from the last word of the Psalm you come to the word "spear."

This is either a singular coincidence or, in the Baconian sense, conclusive evidence that Shakespeare was the translator of this version of Psalm xlv.

Mr. Irving added as a postscript :—

P.S.—Psalm xlv. has at the end of it the word "Selah." I have not counted that word as part of the Psalm, as I believe it to be a sort of direction of some kind which is not at present quite clearly understood. But Professor Tyrrell points out that the cryptogrammatists would, of course, eagerly jump at this word as affording an additional proof of Shakespeare's authorship of the English version of this Psalm, if not of all the Psalms. For the word "Selah" contains the initial letters of the following sentence, "Shakespeare Est Libri Auctor Hijus."

This brought from Mr. W. T. Smedley the following

letter, which appeared in the *Saturday Review* of the 12th of November.

The tercentenary of the Authorised Version of the Bible is to be celebrated next year. It is curious that Mr. H. B. Irving should start a controversy on the authorship of the translation at such a moment. Hitherto, the Authorised Version has been known as King James' Bible. The name of John Rainoldes has perhaps been more closely associated with it than any other, although he did not live to see the publication. It was he who made the demand for the revision at the Hampton Court Conference in 1603, but now Mr. Irving announces a discovery by Professor Tyrrell claiming the authorship of the translation for Shakespeare.

The names of two of the translators were withheld and have not come down to us. It is possible that Shakespeare and Ben Jonson were included as poets.

The curious coincidence in the forty-sixth Psalm of the position of the words "shake" and "speare" has often been used; but Professor Tyrrell is entitled to the full credit of the discovery of the cryptomatic use of the word "Selah."

There is a saying in Germany that the English have two books—the Bible and Shakespeare, and that Shakespeare wrote the Bible. But it is in your issue of 5th November that, so far as I know, for the first time the point has been raised in England. Mr. H. B. Irving says that the Authorised Version was completed in the year 1610. If my recollection serves me rightly either Gribble or Westcott, in his book on "The History of the Bible," states that the translators brought the results of their labours to the King in 1609, and that he handed them back *completed* in 1610. Are we to imagine that King James called in the assistance of Shakespeare in adding the finishing touches to the work of the translators? Professor Saintsbury has said: "The plays of Shakespeare and the English Bible are, and will ever be, the twin monuments, not merely of their own period but of the perfection of English, and complete expression of the literary capacities of the language." It would be difficult to find any Elizabethan writer, except the man who penned prose passages in Act II., scene 2 of *Hamlet*, and Act IV., scene 1 of *Henry V.*, who was capable of transforming the previous translations of the Psalms into the superb poetry to be found in the Authorised Version and of writing such a prose poem as the thirteenth chapter of the first of Corinthians.

One other point. When the publishers of the 1612 First Quarto of the Authorised Version had to select adornments for the title-page of the Genealogies they either supplied Robert Barker, the printer, with or instructed him to use the identical block from which the headpiece of *Venus and Adonis* in 1593 and *Lucrece* in 1594 was printed by Richard Field. I have searched hundreds of books printed between 1594 and 1612 and have not found this block used anywhere in the interval. At the bottom

of the title-page of the *Genealogies* is reproduced the design which is found on the title-page of "The Arte of English Poesie," published anonymously in 1589, with a statement by the printer that he does not know the author. In the 1611 First Folio edition of the Authorised Version at the top of the first page of the *Genealogies* is a headpiece of the well-known design, containing archers, rabbits, and dogs. The same design is also used over the address to "the only and incomparable paire of brethren" in the Folio edition of Shakespeare. Of course, these are only coincidences, but they appear to have some slight bearing on Professor Tyrrell's discovery.

---

In the literary column of the *Observer* of the 11th of December, the following paragraph, evidently referring to this letter, appeared:—

Out of the voluble Shakespeare-Bacon controversy has come the illuminating suggestion that perhaps the writer of the plays, whoever he may have been, may also have given to us some of the most beautiful portions of the Authorised Version. Certainly King James' Bible contains some of the most exquisite poetry in our language, and it is a pleasant thought that the great poet may have occupied his closing years with such a task. A comparison between the metrical portions of the Authorised Version and the language of the play makes such an hypothesis by no means strained. Whoever translated the poetry of the Scriptures must at least have been a great poet himself.

Mr. H. B. Irving may some day be able to look back with pride on having suggested that a singular fact which he advanced *might* be conclusive evidence that Shakespeare was the translator in the Authorised Version, 1611, of Psalm xlv.

---

## REVIEWS.

*The Bi-literal Cypher of Sir Francis Bacon.* Discovered in his works and deciphered by Mrs. Elizabeth Wells Gallup. Part III. Deciphered Secret Story, 1622—1671. The lost manuscripts. Where they were hidden. Detroit, Michaghan, U.S.A.: Howard Publishing Company; London: Gay and Hancock, Ltd. 8vo crown, 8s. 6d. net.

THIS volume contains decipherings of (1) Statements by Bacon and Rawley as to the places in which were deposited the manuscripts of the works of G. Peels, C. Marlow, R. Green, W. Shakespeare, R. Burton and F. Bacon; (2) a continuation of



the story previously deciphered by Mrs. Gallup now found in works published between 1622 and 1671, and reprints from Mrs. Gallup's former works on the deciphering.

It is not an easy task to examine or criticise Mrs. Gallup's work. Those who know her best speak in the warmest terms of her high character and of her belief in and devotion to her work. In the personal note which bears date 1st March, 1899, and which is now reprinted, Mrs. Gallup states that her work has been arduous, exhausting and prolonged, and that it was then unended. Presumably the present volume contains all that may be expected from her. The former publications have been reviewed and discussed so fully in the pages of *BACONIANA* by supporters and opponents that it is unnecessary to travel over the ground again.

If Francis Bacon used the bi-literal cypher which he describes in the "*De Augmentis*" by which to conceal certain messages as to his parentage and works, and if Mrs. Gallup has deciphered those messages there is nothing more to be said. It may at once be admitted that Mrs. Gallup believes she has accomplished this, but without in any degree impugning her good faith it is possible that she is mistaken, and that the messages are not there.

The type in use during the period in which the works were printed is irregular in appearance, and it may readily be found that without in any degree imputing bad faith Mrs. Gallup's confidence and enthusiasm have led her into the illusory belief that the manipulation which she constructs of the type are not her work, but were by design arranged when the books were printed.

Reality is said to be founded on illusion, but illusion itself springs from the same sources, and the psychologist knows how often the senses are untrustworthy guides. The discovery of the N-rays, published by M. Blondlot, received recognition and even acclamation in France, but subsequently observers have been unable to confirm their existence, and it is now considered probable that their discovery rested on illusion. The irregularities of type undoubtedly present in the works deciphered by Mrs. Gallup are of every gradation, and the evidence of the senses of any one person requires confirmation by other workers before it can be accepted.

Several ladies whose integrity is unimpeachable have worked with Mrs. Gallup and confirm her deciphering, but it may be said that so far none of these have been able successfully to continue the work without her assistance.

Prefixed to the present volume is a publisher's note bearing the signature of the Howard Publishing Company. In this note, after recalling the various revelations which have been made through the medium of Mrs. Gallup's decipherings, the publishers say :—

"All this accurately written out in the old English spelling and language of that time, and in such manner that the italic letters in all the sixty odd original editions as translated, fitting

'in groups of five,' according to the bi-literal system of Bacon, as found in 'De Augmentis,' and arranged with such precision that every letter—some of them are easily differentiated—should uniformly and accurately be found in its place as 'a' font or 'b' font would be her own achievement. The impossibility and the obscurity of all this is apparent in the enumeration. With an imagination so fertile, a creative genius of such power and possibilities, broader and more agreeable fields of activity would have furnished much more profitable employment than following a cipher through such a labyrinth. If she had sought to construct a romance about Bacon and his times it would have been along lines more pleasing and better known, would not have antagonised popular belief or challenged authorship of literature that will remain immortal."

In the foregoing paragraph there is a great deal of begging the question. The point at issue is whether the italic letters fitting in groups of five are arranged with such precision that every letter is found uniformly and accurately in its place. Confirmation of this statement is not found outside Mrs. Gallup and her immediate *entourage*. The cipher story is not accurately written out in the old English spelling and language of that time. Accuracy in the spelling of that period is an utter impossibility, as there was no defined standard. The same may be said about the language. But Mrs. Gallup enjoys a very wide margin for irregularities. Elision of letters is frequent in the cipher story, and under circumstances that rarely if ever occur in reputable works of that period and certainly not in Bacon's. In the spelling there is a latitude as wide as the hills are asunder. The narrative is not in the main original. It follows very closely the story deciphered in 1893 in the works issued by the Howard Publishing Company for Dr. Ward Owen, with whom Mrs. Gallup was then associated. Of course this is no argument against the authenticity of the cipher story, for if Dr. Ward Owen's be true, so is Mrs. Gallup's, but it effectually disproves the publishers' claim for originality. Mrs. Gallup follows in beaten tracks.

The most serious difficulty, however, to anyone willing, if reasonable proof be forthcoming, to be convinced, who has some knowledge of, if not familiarity with, Bacon's varied styles of writing is that the style which Mrs. Gallup has discovered is not merely unlike his other styles, but absolutely inconsistent with them. There is one feature which pervades every sentence which Bacon wrote—the perfect musical effect produced by the words when spoken. It is that which distinguishes him from every other writer of the period, and by which he may always be recognised. This is absent in Mrs. Gallup's story. Nor is the method of telling the story Bacon's. There are pages and pages of rambling nothings—reiteration upon reiteration. With every desire to recognise some touch of the master's hand, one is compelled to turn away baffled and disappointed. Nor is reassurance

to be obtained from a perusal of the decipherings from "The Felicity of Queen Elizabeth," 1651, "The Resuscitatio," 1657 and 1671. The last-mentioned work was published at a time when the spelling of words was gradually assuming regularity, but Mrs. Gallup finds no change. The orthography remains the same as in the earlier works, as also does the style. Volume III. of "The Bi-literal Cipher of Sir Francis Bacon" discovered in his works does not strengthen the previous volumes. Before an intelligent belief can be held by the impartial student in the use, as indicated by Mrs. Gallup, of this cipher some further evidence must be forthcoming.

Bacon was a master of the art of cipher writing. He lived in an age when it was cultivated in every Court of Europe. There are extant evidences in his own handwriting of the care and industry with which he studied the various treatises which had been published on the art. He used ciphers to an extent which increases the wonder with which one regards the marvellous characteristics of his mind. But to those who know this branch of his work nothing would be more surprising than that he should make use of a cipher and publish the key to it. Nothing could be more improbable. Only by following his inductive method can be found the key or code of any of the ciphers which he used.

---

## CORRESPONDENCE.

### The First Edition of Burton's Anatomy of Melancholy.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—In looking through Burton's "Anatomy" I recently came across a marginal note which is, I think, of considerable interest to those who study the bibliography of the period of this book's production. This marginal note first appears in the 1638—or 5th—edition as we count it. It is repeated in all the subsequent editions, but is not in any of the previous. In Part III., sec. 2, Memb. 2, subject 1 of the work being on page 444 of the 1638 edition, Burton refers to a book by "Ferandus, a Frenchman, in his Eretigue Mel. (which † book came first to my hands after the third edition)." The cross between "which" and "book" refers to the marginal note, and thus reads: "Printed at Paris, 1624, seven years after my first edition." Now this would make Burton's edition in 1617, whereas the first edition as we know it is 1621. What is the explanation of this? Or has anyone come across in any other place an allusion to this 1617 edition?

Yours faithfully,

(Signed), GRENVILLE C. CUNINGHAM.

January 3rd, 1911.